UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,516	04/03/2006	Alan Bradburn	8952000004	6946
27572 7590 12/24/2008 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 828		ILAN, RUTH		
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/574,516	BRADBURN, ALAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ruth Ilan	3616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Se	eptember 2008.					
	action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 10-16</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10-16</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) <u>7 AND 8</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
··· <u> </u>	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
,—						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	o□	(PTO 440)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 3616

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartmeyer et al. (US 5,492,363.) See Figure 7 and col. 7, lines 45-57. Hartmeyer et al. teaches an inflatable airbag including an elastic inner membrane (52, described as being in the place of 68 of Figure 7 in col. 7, lines 46) provided in the peripheral wall of the airbag (64) and an outer membrane with a pucker (66) that is, regarding claim 9, integral with the material of the airbag. A plurality of vent holes (82) are in the inner membrane and the outer membrane extends across the inner membrane and the vent holes. The pucker defines an outlet flow path and the inner membrane is configured to stretch and seal (see col. 7, lines 40-45.) The inner membrane is secured across An aperture (67) formed in the fabric of the airbag. The inner membrane is stitched to the fabric (at 74.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3616

4. Claims 2, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmeyer et al. (US 5,492,363.) Hartmeyer et al. is discussed above, and with respect to claim 2 does not specifically disclose silicone. Hartmeyer does however indicate that rubber is considered to be suitable. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to choose silicone as the material of construction, because silicone is a type of rubber that is well known for its elasticity and it has been held to be an obvious matter of design choice to choose a material based on its suitability for the intended purpose. Regarding claim 6, glued seams are a well known engineering expedient, and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to glue the seams, in place of sewing, as a matter of design choice.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 7 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claims 10-16 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 9/23/2008 have been fully considered but they are only partially persuasive. With respect the arguments regarding claim 1 and Hartmeyer, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. On page 10 of Applicant's remarks the Applicant states " In particular, Hartmeyer fails to disclose that the " ... outer membrane [is] provided on the outside of the airbag so as to extend across at least part of the inner

Art Unit: 3616

member and the vent-hole..." Instead, Hartmeyer discloses that the outer membrane (66) is integrally formed with the airbag". It is the Examiner's position that a reasonable interpretation of the language of claim 1 includes an integral outer membrane, especially given Applicant's own disclosure, and since Applicant originally intended this language to include such an embodiment (see cancelled claim 9, and paragraph [0017].)

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth Ilan whose telephone number is 571-272-6673. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3616

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-6952. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ruth Ilan Primary Examiner Art Unit 3616

/Ruth Ilan/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3616